

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

VOL. XLIII, No. 8



JANUARY 23, 1950

WHOLE No. 1110

CONTENTS

WHITNEY J. OATES: <i>Securus Iudicat Orbis Terrarum</i>	115
WALDO E. SWEET: The Horizontal Approach	118
FRANKLIN B. KRAUSS: C. A. A. S. Rome Scholarship of 1950	121
Brief Communications	121
CHARLES S. RAYMENT: Roman Anti-Gambling Measures; E. ADELAIDE HAHN: Mediterranean and Pacific; JAMES A. NOTOPOULOS: The Shrop- shire Lad and Plato.	
Reviews	123
Alfred Noyes, <i>Horace: A Portrait</i> (William G. Fletcher); Allan Chester Johnson and Louis C. West, <i>Byzantine Egypt: Economic Studies</i> (Naphtali Lewis); Sister Mary Josephine Suelzer, <i>Julianus Pomerius,</i> <i>The Contemplative Life</i> (Charles C. Mierow); T. J. Haarhoff, <i>Vergil</i> <i>the Universal</i> (Donald C. Mackenzie).	
Notes and News	127
Books Received	127

Announcing:

LEAVE YOUR LANGUAGE ALONE!

By Robert A. Hall, Jr., Cornell University

An exposition of the results of modern linguistics and of their bearing on our everyday language problems: correct speech, spelling, language teaching, international languages, linguistic nationalism. *Leave Your Language Alone!* has well been called "a key to linguistic freedom"; it presents a program for a moderate, liberal, tolerant attitude in matters of language.

Leave Your Language Alone! is suitable for use in courses dealing with language subjects: general language, linguistics, and teaching methods, and furnishes valuable background and orientation reading for teachers and students of ancient and modern languages.

"We wish Hall's book wide success with the public in general, and, most emphatically, with the teachers of languages."

—Henry M. Hoenigswald, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY.

275 pages; \$3.00 net. Order from:

LINGUISTICA, Box 619, Ithaca, N. Y.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE ATLANTIC STATES

Forty-Third Annual Meeting

FRIDAY AND SATURDAY, APRIL 14 AND 15, 1950

at

LEHIGH UNIVERSITY

BETHLEHEM, PENNSYLVANIA

PLAN TO ATTEND!

For details regarding transportation and hotel accommodations, please see *CW*, XLIII (1949-50), 98. The complete program will be published about March 1, 1950.

A TEMPORARY GUIDE TO STYLE, AND NOTES FOR CONTRIBUTORS

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is cooperating in the formulation of a uniform style-sheet for periodicals devoted to classical philology and archaeology, a project initiated by the Editor of the *American Journal of Archaeology*. The present notes are intended to serve temporarily, until the new guide is issued.

For the present, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY will conform in the main to *A Manual of Style* (11th ed.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949); cf. especially pp. 137-53. The footnotes of recent volumes of *Classical Philology* offer a convenient guide to the style set by the *Chicago Manual*, and may be used instead of the *Manual* itself. Please note, however, two important exceptions:

1. Please avoid entirely the use of 'ff.' Instead, please indicate specifically the end of the passage you have in mind, as in the following examples: pp. 24-27, 105-6, 107-13, 122-28, 136-85, 1205-8, 1204-15, 1223-25, 1237-1352. But the symbol 'f.' may be used to indicate a single succeeding page: for pages 253 and 254, either pp. 253 f. or pp. 253-54.

2. Please disregard § 324 of the *Chicago Manual*, pp.

193-95, which deals with the placing of footnotes in the typescript. Instead please assemble the footnotes, typed double spaced, at the end of the article, preferably commencing them on a new page.

For references to periodicals, any recognizable abbreviations, consistent within a given article, may be used. The short forms listed in recent volumes of *L'Année Philologique* or the *Transactions of the American Philological Association* are entirely acceptable. For all but the very best-known reference works, please give place and date of publication. For the names and works of ancient authors, the abbreviations listed in the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Oxford, 1949), pp. ix-xix, are recommended, but again, any consistent and unambiguous abbreviations may be used.

All copy (including quotations and verse passages) should be typed double-spaced, on 8½" by 11" paper. Wide margins should be left at top and bottom, and at both sides. Please omit all indications of type-face, except a single underline for italics. A carbon copy of the typescript should be retained, in case the original should go astray in the mails.

Contributions in all areas of classical philology are solicited. Especially welcome are articles and notes of general classical interest, wide enough in scope to appeal to the entire range of our readers. Also very welcome are communications of moderate length reporting the results of specialized research in classical fields. Less technical items dealing with the authors commonly read in schools and colleges, and with problems of classical teaching at all levels, will be gratefully received.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Published weekly (each Monday), from mid-November through the first week of April, except in weeks in which there is an academic vacation (Thanksgiving Day, Christmas, New Year's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday). A volume contains sixteen issues; Volume XLIII contains issues dated November 14, 28; December 5, 12, 19 (1949); January 9, 16, 23, 30; February 6, 27; March 6, 13, 20, 27; April 3 (1950).

Owner and Publisher, The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. Place of Publication, Hunter College, Bronx Buildings, 2900 Goulden Avenue, New York 63, New York.

Editor, Harry L. Levy, Hunter College, Bronx Buildings, 2900 Goulden Avenue, New York 63, New York. Associate Editor, Edward A. Robinson, Fordham University, New York 58, New York. Assistant Editors, Robert Hennion, Columbia University, New York 27, New York; Ellenor Swallow, Barnard College, New York 27, New York; Waldo E. Sweet, William Penn Charter School, Philadelphia 44, Pennsylvania. Secretary-Treasurer of C. A. A. S., Eugene W. Miller, 3328 Cathedral

of Learning, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh 13, Pennsylvania.

General subscription price, \$3.00 per volume in the Western Hemisphere; elsewhere \$3.50. Price to members of the C. A. A. S., \$2.50. All subscriptions run by the volume. Single numbers, to subscribers, 20 cents, to others, 30 cents prepaid (otherwise 30 cents and 40 cents). If affidavit to invoice is required, 60 cents must be added to the subscription price. For residents of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia, a subscription to THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY (or, alternatively, to the *Classical Journal*) is included in the membership fee of the C. A. A. S., whose members are also entitled to the *Classical Outlook* and the *Classical Journal* at special prices in combinations available from the Secretary-Treasurer of the C. A. A. S.

Reentered as second class matter December 2, 1949 at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in the Act of February 28, 1925 authorized December 2, 1949.

VOL. XLIII, No. 8

JANUARY 23, 1950

WHOLE No. 1110

SECURUS IUDICAT ORBIS TERRARUM¹

Cardinal Newman has vividly recorded in his *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* his intense inner struggle while he was attempting to decide whether or not to abandon the Anglican Church and join the Roman Communion. Just at the moment when his internal conflict seemed impossible of solution, he read an article by a friend in the *Dublin Review*, in which a casual comment of Saint Augustine was quoted, *securus iudicat orbis terrarum*. Suddenly the idea that "the world's judgment is secure" struck him with tremendous force. He read the phrase again and again, and, as by a miracle, all Newman's doubts fell away. The words provided him with that rational sanction for which he was longing. According to his own testimony, the phrase was for him exactly like the "Turn again, Whittington" of the chime, or the *Tolle, lege* of Saint Augustine himself.

Quite apart from the area of religion, the problems raised by any appeal to the principle of the judgment of this world are fascinating in their variety. Among other things, it undermines the validity of private judgment, but at the same time it provides ultimately the principle to which all of us who are committed to democracy and faith in the judgment of a people must give our full allegiance. On the other hand, it may encourage the familiar and opportunistic advice to the young that they should quickly come to learn what the world thinks and judges and seems to want if they are to win easy success. This kind of counsel, youth frequently learns, can be

specious, if not disastrous. Certainly, the principle in *securus iudicat orbis terrarum* leaves no room for the truth involved in a remark of Thoreau, who reminds us that if we see one young man marching out of step with the rest of his fellows, we should always remember that maybe he is listening to the music of another drum.

Perhaps some light can be thrown on the question if we contrast the weight of the principle as it may be applied "instantaneously" with its validity in a "cumulative" perspective. Conceived "instantaneously," that is, as the total judgment of the world at any given moment, the principle can produce painful error. Witness the argument in the first book of Plato's *Republic* where Socrates refutes Polemarchus' view that justness amounts to doing good to one's friends and evil to one's enemies. Polemarchus is plainly expressing a current conventional view of justness, that is, what the world thinks justness is. Socrates upsets this judgment of the world by asserting simply that it is impossible for a genuinely just man to do an act of evil. Or one could cite Socrates' brilliantly ironic attack upon the way in which the world, in its contemporary "instantaneous" judgment, looked upon rhetoric. In the *Gorgias*, Socrates builds up a wonderful paradox, the full implications of which he employs with telling effect. If, he argues, "justice" is the cure of the most deadly of the diseases of the soul, then, according to the conventional moral thinking of the time, rhetoric should be used to see to it that one's friends are punished by the law. Only thus can they be relieved of the burden of their injustice. By the same token, all the powers of rhetoric should be brought to bear in order that one's enemies may continue to wallow in their injustice unpunished, for in no other way can they be more

¹ This paper was read at a meeting of the Classical Association of the New England States at Milton, Massachusetts, on March 18, 1949.

severely harmed. As Callicles, Socrates' opponent in argument, remarks, "this is surely turning the world upside down."

Plato more than once presents Socrates as one who is "listening to the music of another drum." A most vivid instance occurs toward the end of the *Gorgias*, when Socrates asserts that he himself is virtually the only true politician of his time. And then with bitter irony Plato has Socrates describe his probable treatment if ever he should chance to be haled into court. Socrates says, "I shall be tried just as a physician would be tried in a court of little boys at the indictment of the cook. What would he reply in such a case, if someone were to accuse him, saying, 'O my boys, many evil things has this man done to you: he is the death of you, especially of the younger ones among you, cutting and burning and starving and suffocating you, until you know not what to do; he gives you the bitterest potions, and compels you to hunger and thirst. How unlike the variety of meats and sweets on which I feasted you!' What do you suppose that the physician would reply when he found himself in such a predicament? If he told the truth he could only say: 'All this, my boys, I did for your health,' and then would there not just be a clamour among a jury like that? How they would cry out!" (*Gorgias*, 521 e 3, Jowett's translation.) Everyone knows the "instantaneous" judgment made upon Socrates. His world killed him. But the "cumulative" judgment of the world as it has grown in time totally reverses the "instantaneous" judgment, and Socrates is revered as one of the very greatest men within the Western Tradition.

Let us apply the principle of *securus indicat orbis terrarum* to the field of classical learning. In its "instantaneous" aspect, there is no other answer than that our contemporary world rejects the classics. It applauds psychology, educationism, science, and, sad to say, the social studies, especially when they are pseudo-scientific. But classicists actually do rely upon the soundness of the world's judgment in its "cumulative" aspect. After all, this judgment accounts not only for the preservation of the monuments of classical literature and thought, but also has insisted throughout the centuries upon affirming the high worth of these monuments.

It is reasonable to ask why this "cumulative" judgment has been as it is. Perhaps the best way to answer the question is to introduce the conception of *Reality as it really is*, Reality with a capital R, or "Reality (loud cheers)," as Sir Arthur Eddington is said to have designated it. Philosophers have varied in their views concerning the nature of this Reality. Some have maintained that it consists merely of that which man can see. Others argue that there is a timeless and transcendent aspect to it. But the interesting point is that, no matter how wide the range of disagreement, they all assume that there is such a thing as *Reality as it really is*. The disagreement actually indicates that,

human limitations being what they are, the ultimate nature of Reality as it really is must remain unknown to us. However, this does not imply that human experience in its totality cannot provide significant clues concerning this Reality. And, in fact, many of those clues are to be found in the great creative achievements of man which have survived the assaults of time. May it not be that this is the ultimate touchstone of a great work of art, that it incorporates within it a view which most closely approximates Reality as it really is, and therefore has evoked among human beings a virtually unanimous and enduring response of approval?

There are many such great works of art among the classics, as anyone will admit. As an illustration of the thesis that the great work of art does throw light on essential nature of Reality, let us take the view of man found implicitly in Homer's *Iliad*. Here man is portrayed as a being who has vital relations with a Reality which in the poet's mind has three aspects. Man is seen in his relation to the world of nature, as he appears in his relation to society, and finally in relation to the supernatural world of the gods. This view of man obviously presupposes that the Reality in which he exists is not limited by the physical universe only, but has a divine dimension in terms of which he must face his human predicament.

Furthermore, Homer gives us a picture of man as conditioned *simultaneously* by three forces, or three types of determinism. Man in the *Iliad* is controlled by the conventions of his society or environment. Witness, for example, the behavior of Glaucus and Diomedes when they meet upon the field of battle. During the formal interchange of words prior to the commencement of the actual duel, they discover that their respective families before them have been related as "guest-friends," and consequently the "chivalric" conventions of society compel them to forego the fight. The *Iliad* is replete with instances of the gods exerting their control over men. The uncritical reader often is led by this situation

EDITORIAL ANNOUNCEMENT

The Editor and the Associate Editor take pleasure in announcing the appointment to the staff of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY of three Assistant Editors: Mr. Robert Hennion of Columbia University, Dr. Ellenor Swallow of Barnard College, and Dr. Waldo E. Sweet of the William Penn Charter School. In addition to other editorial duties, Mr. Hennion will be concerned with the procurement of books for notice and review, Dr. Swallow with the responsibility for the index to this volume, and Dr. Sweet with matters pertaining to the teaching of the classics in the secondary schools.

to believe that men are mere pawns or puppets for the gods to do with what they will. Sometimes, indeed, this is true, but the fact remains that in all crucial instances Homer presents man as self-determined, that is, as possessing a will in a vital sense free. For example, when Hector goes out to defend his city, he does so out of a free decision of his own will, with no god assisting, even though he has an overpowering presentiment of the fate awaiting him. Or, to take another illustration, at the end of the famous embassy scene, when Achilles' comrades-in-arms urge him to rejoin the battle, he freely decides in the negative. Moreover, again he acts of his own free will, when he decides to return to the fight after the death of his dearest friend Patroclus, for at this point Achilles begins to realize the appalling consequences of his earlier behavior. In fact, it is not too much to say that we know the essential natures of Hector and Achilles, or, for that matter, any character, by virtue of their free acts as persons possessed of free will.

For our own time, the significance of this Homeric view of man may be seen in the reaction of a student who was taking an adult education course in which the *Iliad* was being discussed. As soon as he realized the full implications of Homer's portrait of man, he immediately noted the extreme disparity between it and the Marxist attitude. Man, as Homer delineates him, is a far cry from the man of Marxian dogma, who is an economic animal and is caught in the inexorable web of economic determinism. To the attentive reader, as he compares the two views, the infinitely greater depth and richness of the Homeric, as against the Marxist, attitude cannot fail to be apparent, despite the fact that the Marxist, of course, would argue the Homeric view to be in error.

How is anyone to know? In any absolute sense, he probably cannot. But the well-nigh universal respect for the *Iliad* since it first appeared at the very outset of Western literature constitutes no mean item of evidence that somehow Homer's view of human nature approximates closely to the nature of man as it really is. Or, one could put this proposition conversely, that is, in addition to its formal excellence, since the *Iliad* expresses such a "realistic" view of man's nature, it was bound to evoke the universal response among men which in fact it has.

Much the same kind of point can be made in connection with many of the Greek tragedies. Certainly it is relevant in the case of Sophocles' *Oedipus the King*, if we ask why it is great and worthy of so long a survival. And here it is proper to protest against the relatively popular contemporary critical view that the *Oedipus* is merely a tragedy of fate. This view invites one to look at the play as one would observe an entomologist with a bug impaled upon his laboratory table, who watches it

struggle until it dies. If such were an acceptable interpretation of the play, it is difficult to see why human beings should have given more than a moment's attention to it. It is far more reasonable to contend that the play expresses a deep principle at the heart of Reality and of human nature. Paul Elmer More once very wisely summed up this principle in the *Oedipus* when he remarked that the play underscored man's intellectual impotence and at the same time his moral responsibility. For this reason, it has become a universal tragedy for mankind.

Now, if we grant that the classics are rich with many monuments of the order of the *Iliad* and *Oedipus the King* which present significant insights into the nature of Reality as it really is, why is it that the "instantaneous" judgment of the world is now unfavorable? No doubt the field has suffered because of the pragmatic and materialistic trends of the times, but it would be a mistake to cite this as the sole responsible cause for the situation. Much of the fault can be attributed to the scholars in the field who have lost sight of the basic values in the classics which account for the world's "cumulative" judgment. And in many ways, what can be asserted of scholarship in the classics can apply as well to the other fields of the humanities and the social sciences. If this contention is sound, then it suggests that the cure for the unfavorable "instantaneous" judgment of our contemporary world can most effectively be brought about by scholars in the classics. They must be willing to re-think their whole enterprise in relation to the ultimate goals of scholarship in the subject. Those goals cannot be considered apart from those qualities which make the classics great.

Fortunately, there is evidence that more and more scholars are prepared to engage in this task of re-thinking. The Modern Language Association has a committee on the goals of scholarship in its field. The American Philological Association has created a "Committee for the Diffusion of Philological Knowledge." Also, at Princeton University, a recent report entitled *Princeton and Scholarship* was published by the University Research Committee, whose mission it is to allocate available funds in support of research in the University in the social sciences and the humanities. The report itself, after distinguishing the natural sciences from the other two general divisions of human knowledge, insists that there is no radical difference between the social sciences and the humanities, since man is at the heart of both disciplines. The report then undertakes to define "significant scholarship" in the two areas: "Significant scholarship... may be defined as that which through the advancement of knowledge contributes to the improvement of man's relation with his fellows and to the increasing of man's understanding of himself, his past, and the world of facts and values in which he lives."

In expanding this definition, the report continues: "In

the past one hundred years, the products of scholarship in the humanities and the social sciences have often been trivial, pedantic, and irrelevant. The Committee is unanimous in its belief that any tendencies in this direction should be vigorously discouraged. Triviality, pedantry, and irrelevance, the Committee believes, have been fostered, first, by a confusion of ends and means on the part of scholars, second, by the pervasive tendency on the part of the universities to judge scholarship on a purely quantitative basis, and, third, by faulty selection of personnel. The only remedy for this situation lies in the continual effort to appraise scholarship objectively with respect to means and ends, and always to make evaluation turn as far as possible on the terms of its relation to the ultimate goal as it has been defined. This is at best a difficult and delicate task, yet it constitutes an obligation which a university must assume."

The whole argument boils down to this: that classicists may best reverse the "instantaneous" judgment of our time upon their field by engaging in "significant scholarship." Only in this way can "significant scholarship," in whatever form it may take, be in accord with the world's "cumulative" judgment. If we are engaged in a project which is a means to a further end, we must never allow the project to assume the role of an end in itself. Rather we must always see it in relation to ultimate ends. Our job must be always to address ourselves to ends, whether our approach be direct or indirect. In the classics, those ends are most nearly approached by a devotion to what the "cumulative" judgment of the world has found or ultimately will find good. What the world has found good can be nothing other than what reveals Reality as it really is. If we fix our attention on this point, we shall be able to identify the more easily the goals for which we must strive in our scholarship. If we keep these goals in mind, we shall be able to recognize means when they are really means, and never mistake a means for an end.

Owing to the inexhaustible richness of the resources of the field, classicists in their scholarship can significantly contribute to the improvement of man's relation with his fellows, and can increase man's understanding of himself, his past, and the world of facts and values in which he lives. The "instantaneous" world's judgment can then be reversed. We shall be able to take the sob and the moan out of the classics. We can take the offensive, we can cease forever from making apologies. We can, through significant scholarship, recreate the spirit which underlies the closing words of Plato's *Gorgias*, a passage compressing within it so much that is at the very core of our common undertaking. This is Socrates' parting exhortation to the proto-Nietzschean Callicles: "Follow me then, and I will lead you where you will be happy in life and after death, as your own argument shows. And never mind if someone despises you as a fool, and insults you, if he has a mind; let him

strike you, by Zeus, and do you be of good cheer, and do not mind the insulting blow, for you will never come to any harm in the practice of virtue, if you are a really good and true man. When we have practised virtue together, we will apply ourselves to politics, if that seems desirable, or we will advise about whatever else may seem good to us, for we shall be better able to judge then. In our present condition we ought not to give ourselves airs, for even on the most important subjects we are always changing our minds; and what a state of education does that imply! Let us, then, take the argument as our guide, which has revealed to us that the best way of life is to practise justice and every virtue in life and death. This way let us go; and in this exhort all men to follow, not in the way in which you trust and in which you exhort me to follow you; for that way, Callicles, is nothing worth." (*Gorgias*, 527 c 4, Jowett's translation.)

WHITNEY J. OATES

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

THE HORIZONTAL APPROACH*

If we were to make the statement that there are a lot of forms to learn in first-year Latin, we would get much support, especially from the first-year students. Diederich says¹ that the average textbook expects the first-year student to memorize about 1500 forms. Granted that the Latin inflectional system is one of the inevitable difficulties to overcome, it does seem as if the matter had been made unnecessarily complicated. Students are drilled upon distinctions which not only are unimportant, but which often exist only in the minds of grammarians.² Surely, all that we should expect of our students in this respect is to recognize instantly and accurately the form and function of the Latin words they meet. And yet even the mastery of paradigms in their supposedly pure and undefiled state does not guarantee a knowledge of Latin. We have all seen the student who can glibly recite forms but cannot identify them in context, the only situation in which such knowledge could be of any use.

Teachers have wasted valuable classroom hours teaching the difference between third declension nouns with genitive plural in *-um* and those with *-ium*: *marium*,

* This article is a revised and amplified version of a section of a paper "Experiments in Teaching Vocabulary, Grammar, and Forms" read at the Autumn Meeting of the Classical Association of the Atlantic States at Atlantic City, New Jersey, on November 26, 1949.

¹ Paul E. Diederich, *The Frequency of Latin Words and Their Endings* (Chicago, 1939), p. 21.

² For a discussion of the same problem in syntax, see John F. Gummere, "Latin Grammar in Proper Perspective," *CJ*, XLV (1949-50), 37-40.

they have insisted, is right, and *marum* is wrong. A greater waste of time could hardly be devised; the genitive plural of *mare* occurs in Latin literature only once,³ and here the form is *marum*, not *marium*. How much better to have the student concentrate upon the significant morphemic element, the *-um*. This may best be done, I suggest, by teaching the genitive (or any other case) "horizontally," that is, across all the declensions at once. When one does this, the differences between declensions largely vanish. I shall confine my observations to the five major cases, giving a description, useful for teaching purposes, which takes into account linguistic history. The treatment, however, is essentially descriptive, not historical.

Latin nouns⁴ have a characteristic vowel,⁵ which may be *-a*, *-e*, *-i*, *-o*, *-u*, or "no-vowel," written *-(0)*. Nouns are classed into declensions according to the vowel. The same ending combined with different vowels sometimes gives various diphthongs or vowels; in a few instances some declensions will have an ending different from the rest. The vowels, and the declensions they indicate, are as follows:

1st declension: *-a*

2nd declension: *-o*

3rd declension: *-e*, *-i*, *-(0)*

4th declension: *-u*

5th declension: *-ē*

The endings which are added to these vowels are as follows:

Nom. sg.: *-(0)*; ⁶ *-s*; neuters have *-m* or *-(0)*

Gen. sg.: *variable*

Dat. sg.: *variable*

Acc. sg.: *-m*, vowel always short, neuters like nom.

Abl. sg.: *-(0)*, vowel usually long

Nom. pl.: *-i*, *-s*, neuters in *-a*

Gen. pl.: *-rum*, *-um*

Dat. pl.: *like the ablative plural*

Acc. pl.: *-s*, vowel always long, neuters like nom.

Abl. pl.: *-is*, *-bus*

Here are the same endings grouped by declension (neuters have been omitted for the sake of simplification):

³ Cf. TLL, s. v. "mare," col. 377, lines 69 f.

⁴ In the rest of the paper the term "noun" will also include adjectives, participles, and (except as otherwise noted) pronouns.

⁵ Hereafter called simply "the vowel." I have refrained from marking or referring to the length of vowels except where the quantity is of special significance.

⁶ The symbol *-(0)* indicates "no-ending."

	1	2	3	4	5
	<i>-a</i>	<i>-o</i>	<i>-e</i> , <i>-i</i> , <i>-(0)</i>	<i>-u</i>	<i>-ē</i>
	SINGULAR				
Nom.:	<i>-(0)</i> , <i>-s</i>	<i>-(0)</i> , <i>-s</i>	<i>-(0)</i> , <i>-s</i>	<i>-s</i>	<i>-s</i>
Gen.:			<i>variable</i>		
Dat.:			<i>variable</i>		
Acc.:	<i>-m</i>	<i>-m</i>	<i>-m</i>	<i>-m</i>	<i>-m</i>
Abl.:	<i>-(0)</i>	<i>-(0)</i>	<i>-(0)</i>	<i>-(0)</i>	<i>-(0)</i>
	PLURAL				
Nom.:	<i>-i</i>	<i>-i</i>	<i>-s</i>	<i>-s</i>	<i>-s</i>
Gen.:	<i>-rum</i>	<i>-rum</i>	<i>-um</i>	<i>-um</i>	<i>-rum</i>
Dat.:			<i>like the ablative plural</i>		
Acc.:	<i>-s</i>	<i>-s</i>	<i>-s</i>	<i>-s</i>	<i>-s</i>
Abl.:	<i>-is</i>	<i>-is</i>	<i>-bus</i>	<i>-bus</i>	<i>-bus</i>

The nominative singular has the ending *-(0)* in such words as *puella*, *puer*, *victor*; in *puer* the final short *-o* has been lost.⁷ The ending *-s* is seen in *Aeneas*, *servus*, *caedes*, *hostis*, *dux* (i.e. *duc-s*), *manus*, *dies*. *Servus* represents an older *servos*, in which the *-o* weakened to *-u*. In the third declension *caedes*, *hostis*, and *dux* we see the vowels *-e*, *-i*, and *-(0)*.

Since the linguistic history of the genitive and dative singular is complicated, and since these cases are comparatively rare,⁸ we have listed them as "variable."

The ending of the accusative singular is *-m*. In the second declension, the *-o* weakens to *-u*, as in the nominative. The *-e* and *-i* of the third are both seen in *caedem* and *turrim*.

The ending of the ablative singular may be regarded descriptively as *-(0)*, with the vowel long, unless it is *-e* in the third declension. In *mari* we see the vowel as *-i*, while in the variant *mare* we see it as *-e*; in both cases we can call the ending *-(0)*.

The nominative plural ending is *-s*, although the first two declensions have the pronominal ending *-i*; *-ai* became *-ae*, and *-oi* became *-i*.

The genitive plural ending is *-rum* for the first, second, and fifth, and *-um* for the third and fourth. In the variant forms *caedum* and *caedium* we have *-(0)* and *-i*.

The dative-ablative plural ending is *-is* for the first and second and *-bus* for the other declensions. Both *-ois* and *-ois* became *-is*. Third declension nouns have *-i*, as in *civibus*, although *-(0)* may occur, as in *bobus*. In the fourth, although we do see *-u* occasionally (*arcubus*), it generally changes to *-i* periphras by analogy with the third (*manibus*).

⁷ The technical linguistic information has been taken from Roland G. Kent, *The Forms of Latin* (Baltimore, 1946), *passim*.

⁸ Gerald F. Else has noted that the nominative, accusative, and ablative account for 85 percent of all declined forms in representative passages covering "a considerable range of classical Latin"; cf. *CJ*, XLIV (1948-49), 106 f.

The accusative plural ending is *-s*; the preceding vowel is long. In the variants *hostēs* and *hostis* we find both *-e-* and *-i-*.

The nominative-accusatives of neuters require special explanation. The singular ending is *-m* for second declension nouns and *-(o)* for thirds and the rare fourths. In the second declension, *-o-* weakened as usual to *-u-*. The plural offers a real difficulty to this description, since this form was originally a collective noun of the first declension; perhaps it is best to say that the ending is *-a* and that in the second declension, by exception, there is "no-vowel," instead of *-o-*. In *nomina*, *animalia*, and *cornua* we find *-(o)-*, *-i-*, and *-u-*.

It is necessary to describe some of the linguistic changes which make the nominative of many third declension nouns rather different from the other cases. In his attempt to simplify the noun and verb forms, Diederich says:⁹ "One family of Latin words, called the third declension, ends in almost every conceivable way in the subject form." Using our system, the student learns the endings *-(o)* or *-s* and also studies certain common linguistic phenomena, interesting and instructive in themselves. For example, *nomen*, *nomini*s illustrates vowel weakening from *-men-* to *-min-*. Dentals followed immediately by *-s* were dropped: **peds* became *pes*. A final consonant was often dropped: *lac* for **lact*, *legio* for **legion*. Rhotacism is also found, the process whereby an original *-s-* between two vowels regularly changed to *-r-*. Hence we have *mos*, *moris* (*mos*, **mosis*).

This system covers not only nouns, adjectives, and participles but most of the pronoun forms as well (except for the personals). The nominative singular, however, with a complicated linguistic history, will not fit. It is worth pointing out, nevertheless, that the ending of the nominative-accusative singular of neuters is usually *-d*. The nominative-accusative plural, moreover, is like the feminine nominative singular, even though the forms may not always end in *-a*, e.g. *haec* and *quae*.

To teach by this plan, the teacher should make a chart and keep it constantly in sight, explaining every new form by reference to it. It is of course necessary to fix the forms in a child's mind so that he will recognize *ducum* as a third declension word with the ending *-um* and not as a second or fourth declension word with the ending *-m*. This can best be done by oral reading and written dictation. With the aid of records the class can repeat phrases and clauses from the day's assignment until they are fixed in the mind. We thus rely heavily upon memory work, but we memorize meaningful groups of words rather than paradigms. The mind of the student is furnished with forms and phrases which he sees constantly in his reading and which

he will continue to see in the future, not meaningless words like *marium* and *maribus*.¹⁰

Until the whole pattern is established, the student will make mistakes, some of them ludicrous. But there is nothing to unlearn later; the student has the whole problem before him from the start and knows what he is to master. The vertical system gives a false sense of achievement; students think that Latin is easy at first and get a rude awakening when they meet the third declension. So well have they learned the first two declensions that they mistake *legio* for a dative singular and *potestas* for an accusative plural. What else would a student think who had been told that the ending of the dative was *-o* and the ending of the accusative plural was *-as*?

Unfortunately, no standard text presents its material in this way, and in practice we have had to compromise, teaching the horizontal approach by records and conversation, while at the same time using material in our text book which introduces words by the traditional declensions and conjugations. An ideal text would first teach the nominative and accusative of all declensions and drill upon them until the student had thoroughly mastered the major difficulty of Latin for our students, the concept that the function of a Latin word changes with its form. To impress this upon the students, the reading should use the variegated word order found in Latin authors, not the monotonous nominative-accusative-verb combination traditionally employed. After the nominative and accusative the next case to take up obviously should be the ablative. Not only is it far more common than the genitive or dative, but its formation is easily described: *-(o)* in the singular and *-is* or *-bus* in the plural. With this triad of cases well established, the pupil may then study the genitive and dative.

The horizontal approach would mean a lot in the acquisition of useful vocabulary. At present our students learn a great many first-declension nouns and first-conjugation verbs which they will never see again. Glancing through three or four beginner's texts which I have taken at random from my shelves, I have noted down several words which are used in them. After each I have placed the occurrence of this word in 50,000 running words of classical Latin prose:¹¹ *casa*, 2; *rosa*, 0; *nauta*, 3; *urna*, 1; *puella*, 1; *ursa*, 0; *regina*, 0; *unda*, 0; *ambulo*, 3; *neco*, 5; *monstro*, 1; *clamo*, 2; *porto*, 1.

Frequency is not the only test for inclusion in an elementary text, but I think that these figures suggest that the vertical approach forces our text-book writers to use rare and unusual words, and to postpone many important words until later. Surely we could have more varied,

¹⁰ As has been explained (cf. note 3, above), *marium* is not found; *maribus* occurs once (Caes. BG v. 1. 2; cf. TLL, s. v. "mare," col. 377, line 71).

¹¹ Diederich, *op. cit.* (note 1, above), pp. 44-80.

⁹ *Op. cit.* (note 1, above), p. 23.

useful, and interesting readings by employing basic Latin vocabulary from the beginning, regardless of the declensions or conjugations involved.

The horizontal approach thus seems to have four advantages. It concentrates the student's attention upon what is fundamentally important in inflection; it teaches him actual forms which he sees and uses, not hypothetical ones; it illustrates certain linguistic facts, important in the understanding of language in general; and finally it makes available a realistic vocabulary.

WALDO E. SWEET

WILLIAM PENN CHARTER SCHOOL
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA

C. A. A. S. ROME SCHOLARSHIP OF 1950

At its annual business meeting in 1948, the Classical Association of the Atlantic States established a competitive scholarship for the purpose of encouraging its members in the secondary schools to augment the scope of their teaching by attending the summer session of the School of Classical Studies of the American Academy in Rome. Dr. Anna H. Griffiths, of the Brooklyn Friends' School, Brooklyn, N. Y., the first recipient of this scholarship, attended the 1949 summer session. Her enthusiastic reaction to this experience is matched by the very favorable report which the Director of this session, Professor Mason Hammond of Harvard University, has given us of her work.

The Association is happy to announce that it is able to offer this scholarship for the summer session of 1950. Please note that competition for the scholarship is limited to members of the Association who teach Latin or the Classics in secondary schools, both public and private, within the geographical boundaries of the Association. The financial benefits of the scholarship are: 1) the sum of \$200.00 as an outright award from the Rome Scholarship Fund of the Association; 2) the cancellation of the tuition fee of the summer session in the amount of \$100.00 through the generous action of the Trustees of the American Academy. Together these benefits will cover nearly one-third of estimated basic expenses (\$1000.00) which the recipient will incur in traveling from New York to Rome and return and in attending the summer session.

The American Academy itself will not accept applications for enrollment in the 1950 summer session after March 1. In order, therefore, that the recipient of the Association's Rome Scholarship may be assured of enrollment in this summer session, applications for the scholarship must be sent to the undersigned at 219 Sparks Building, The Pennsylvania State College, State College,

Pennsylvania, early enough so as to be received by him not later than February 11, 1950.

Applicants will please furnish the following data in the order here indicated: name, age, home address, address of the school in which employed; academic biography with respect to degree(s) received with date(s) and institution(s), major and minor fields of study leading to the degree(s); description of the courses which the applicant is now teaching; future academic and teaching plans; a confidential statement of the applicant's need of this scholarship and of the applicant's ability to meet, from personal funds, the remainder of the basic expenses that are not covered by the financial benefits of the scholarship; two letters of recommendation. These data will be held in strict confidence by the members of the Rome Scholarship Committee of the C. A. A. S.

The Association is confident that not a few of its qualified members will enter into competition for the substantial benefits which the scholarship provides toward the realization of what is doubtless one of their major professional aims, study and travel in the homeland of Latin culture.

For the program of the 1950 summer session of the American Academy and for any other information pertaining to attendance at this session, the applicant should write to Miss Mary T. Williams, Executive Secretary, American Academy in Rome, 101 Park Avenue, New York 17, N. Y.

*Haec ubi dicta, locum capiunt signoque repente
corripunt spatia auditio limenque relinquunt,
effusi nimbo similes: simul ultima signant.*

FRANKLIN B. KRAUSS
President, C. A. A. S.

ROMAN ANTI-GAMBLING MEASURES

Antonius, one of the principals in Cicero's *De oratore*, makes no secret of his view (i. 237) that Roman civil law, with its emphasis on such abracadabra as formulas of *coemptio* and actions *herciscundae familiae*, was a tedious business, and few, I suppose, would be disinclined to agree with him. Nevertheless, even Justinian's ponderous *Digest* has its lighter side; for example, in the enumeration of suits which might be brought by an owner, there is a short summary of statutes and decisions designed to curb gambling (xi. 5. 1-4). Authorities cited are Ulpian, Paul, and Marcianus.

Though the passion of the Romans for betting, with or without aid of dice, knuckle bones, and other devices for redistributing the wealth, is too well known to require elaboration, the attempts to restrain it are much less familiar. According to Marcianus, wagering was

permitted *ex lege Titia et Publicia et Cornelia*, but *ex aliis*, *ubi pro virtute certamen non fit*, it was forbidden. What this "rivalry of prowess" was is made more explicit by Paul, who refers to a senatorial decree banning wagers except on one's own skill in throwing the spear or javelin, running, jumping, wrestling, or boxing. We may reasonably conjecture that such restrictions were neither enforceable nor enforced.

In respect to dicing, however, operation of legal safeguards affecting private property must have acted to some extent as a restraint. Paul indicates that slaves (if the disputed reading *familia* in *Dig. xi. 5. 4 ad init.* is correct) might lawfully play when the stake was the food set out for their portion at a banquet; presumably such fare, far better than their usual meager allotment, might be sold, and the proceeds added to the winner's *peculium*. Under other circumstances, the disabilities which the law laid upon slaves made their gains insecure, since their master might appropriate the winnings, being granted an action *de peculio*, *non noxalis*, *quia ex negotio gesto agitur*. Again, if a person enjoying full legal status lost money to a slave or to a minor, the praetor would grant an *utilis actio* against the master of the slave or the parent of the minor. Conversely, if the slave or minor were the loser at play, suit might be brought by master or parent to recover the sum. Neither class of inferiors before the law could often have been invited knowingly to play if the profits or losses were big enough to entail the risk of court action.

Similarly, the suspension of other guarantees usually extended to private property was cleverly exploited to achieve the same result. The "house" received no protection from the courts. Ulpian explicitly states that the praetor denied the *susceptor*, or person in whose home dicing occurred, redress for a beating or any other damage; nor could a theft (unless committed by one of the players) which took place while the game was going on be prosecuted. Of course, this might, and no doubt often did, refer to simple theft of the householder's own property, but apparently hold-ups in which all those on the premises were victimized occurred often enough to merit mention in the latter clause. The wording *sive quid eo tempore dolo eius* [i. e., *susceptoris*] *subtrahatur* est suggests that the host may, on occasion, have connived at and profited by the operations of these outsiders; in such instances the court's refusal to intervene would—exceptionally—have served his advantage. But if one of the participants cheated or robbed his fellow players, the praetor, taking a more lenient attitude, allowed them to bring an action *bonorum raptorum*, even though, as the jurist words it, *et hi indigni videantur*.

Perhaps the most amusing portion of these regulations is the threat, mentioned by Ulpian, of appropriate penalties against anyone who used force to compel

another to play at dice; Paulus gives the explanation: *solent enim quidam et cogere ad lusum vel ab initio* [whoever has labored to recruit a fourth at bridge can understand this excess of zeal] *vel victi dum retinent* [poker players will recognize the impulse of the winner to quit while ahead, and of the losers to dissuade him].

CHARLES S. RAYMENT

CARLETON COLLEGE

MEDITERRANEAN AND PACIFIC

In his fascinating volume *Tales of the South Pacific* (published by Macmillan, 1947, and reprinted in part by Pocket Books, 1948), James A. Michener thus describes the scene of Lt. Cable's meetings with Bloody Mary (page 112 of the Pocket Book edition):

He used to drop by in the hot afternoons. Even the flies would be asleep, and cattle would be in the shade. No birds would sing, and from the cacao trees no lorikeets would fly. It was tropic midday, and Bloody Mary with her lieutenant would sit in the cavernous shade of the banyan tree and talk.

Though, in this picture of a hot, slumberous milieu, lizards are replaced by lorikeets, thorn-bushes by cacao, and beeches by banyans, none the less the classicist reading the passage instantly recalls the opening of Virgil's second Eclogue, especially lines 3-4 and 8-9:

tantum inter densas, umbrosa cacumina, fagos
adsidue veniebat . . .
nunc etiam pecudes umbras et frigora captant;
nunc viridis etiam occultant spineta lacertos.

One wonders whether the echo was coincidental or intentional.

E. ADELAIDE HAHN

HUNTER COLLEGE

THE SHROPSHIRE LAD AND PLATO

In poem LXII Housman exhorts his Shropshire Lad with the following philosophy:

Therefore, since the world has still
Much good, but much less good than ill,
And while the sun and moon endure
Luck's a chance, but trouble's sure,
I'd face it as a wise man would,
And train for ill and not for good.

The premise of this conclusion, as found in the first two lines, is a direct paraphrase of a statement of Plato's about God and man found in *Lysis* 906 a: "we acknowledge the world to be full of much good and also of much evil, and of more evil and good."

Nunc est bibendum is the keynote in this Horatian

poem, and so Plato joins Milton, of whom it is said earlier in the poem:

And malt does more than Milton can
To justify God's ways to man.

JAMES A. NOTOPOULOS

TRINITY COLLEGE, HARTFORD.

REVIEWS

Horace: A Portrait. By ALFRED NOYES. ("Great Writers of the World," Vol. I.) New York: Sheed & Ward, 1947. Pp. xiii, 292. \$3.50.

This is the first in a series of volumes all of which, the jacket announces, will be at the same price and on the same general lines: a biographical portrait, plentiful quotation (with translation), an effort to show the subject in the context of his own day, and his influence on men since. The second volume is to be Boccaccio, by Francis MacManus.

The author states in his preface his alarm at the conflict in scholarly works between erudition and the appreciation of literature. A poet himself, he thus feels "... encouraged to think that there is room for a book on Horace written primarily from the point of view of poetry." Questions of textual criticism have been surrendered to the expert Latinist.

The work, organized in twenty chapters, treats chronologically (with the exception of the first chapter) of Horace's life, his times, and his literary activity. The first chapter contains a fanciful and over-sentimentalized picture of Horace perusing at the Sabine farm (?), over his neglected dinner, the emperor's letter-of-request for his services as secretary. We are plunged in *medias res* "as Horace advised in his *Art of Poetry*" (p. 20). The final chapter gives an estimate of Horace's later influence.

The author reveals his familiarity with the standard literature in English in the field of Horatian studies; but scholarly contributions in German, Italian, and French seem to have been generally neglected.

Mr. Noyes writes of Horace, the poet and the man, with feeling and some insight. He frequently displays a fine sensitiveness to the spirit and the artistry of his verse (cf. the remarks on technique, pp. 258-67). Certainly, his enthusiasm for Horace's work and his character is unmistakable throughout.

The nature of the subject matter has given the author the opportunity to draw upon his wide knowledge of English and European letters and to enrich his narrative by generous quotation therefrom. Some useful remarks on literary criticism are also included in the work, although the statements on the metaphysical implications of inspired poetry on page 191 may well cause

the reader some impatience. Original versions in English verse of Odes 3, 14, and 31 of Book I, and of Odes 9, 18, and 23 of Book III warrant mention from the literary point of view. These have been done in the original meters, since the author believes (pp. 24-25) that the effect of Latin quantitative verse can be reproduced in English "... by an order of words in which the natural stress of English falls where, in the Latin meter, the long, quantitative syllable would demand it and, so far as possible, choosing words in which those stressed syllables are also 'long' [*sic*] ...". Some further elucidation of this last remark would have been helpful. Disregarding the larger question of a faithful imitation of manner, I find that these versions depart somewhat from the strict matter of Horace. In addition to these original pieces, the author has also included his own rendering in English blank verse of *AP* 158-78 (pp. 216-17).

On some old and new points of Horatian criticism, Mr. Noyes displays a sound point of view. He rejects (pp. 150-51) the old *nauseam* theory, and with it Horace's presence at Actium. He rightly argues (pp. 139-46) against the extremist view which would classify all the women of the *Odes* as pure "figments of the imagination" (although some of his remarks in this Chapter XI are open to doubt, e.g., on Tyndaris, p. 142). He insists upon the close connection of Epode 16 and Vergil's Eclogue 4 (pp. 61-73). On the other hand, he peremptorily dismisses (p. 214) any thought of the influence of Neoptolemus on the *AP* without giving any consideration to such recent positive research on the subject as that of C. C. Jensen (*Neoptolemos und Horas* [Berlin, 1919]).

The present work, admirably directed at the educated lay reader, has eschewed the strictly scholarly presentation. It is, however, marred by a number of inaccuracies and inconsistencies. *Si valeas* (p. 7) should be *si vales* (*S. V. B. E. V.*); his "half-drunk" merchant of *Sat.* i. 7 (p. 46) seems to be a misinterpretation of *Italo perfusus aceto* of i. 7. 32; the date of the publication of the *Epodes* is wrongly given on page 75 as nine years after 41 B.C.; the argument (pp. 80-81) for Plato as the source of the ideas in *Odes* i. 14 is strained. Horace's model here is clearly Alcaeus. The ode, incidentally, surely cannot be dated as early as 38 B.C. (p. 79). It is hardly accurate to say that Antony set sail (Spring, 37) for Italy "pretending he was bent on co-operating with Octavian" (p. 83); the statement (p. 84) that Cleopatra was still (at the time of the treaty of Tarentum) the mistress of Antony overlooks the fact that Antony had not seen Cleopatra in the past three years and more; there is a greater difference between Lucilian and Ennian satire than the author would concede (p. 117); Epode 2 surely belongs to a period earlier than that of the composition of the *Georgics*, and thus could have no immediate connection with the grant

of the Sabine farm (p. 129); the suggestion (p. 137) that *Sat. i. 6* was written at the Sabine farm is curious in view of the author's correct dates for the publication of *Satires*, Book I, and the grant of the farm (p. 168); the date of Actium is given as 30 B.C. on p. 154; Horace could hardly be called poet laureate in 30 B.C. (p. 171); the two statements "Horace felt the approaching peril [i. e. that 'the Roman Empire ... was moving like an avalanche to its own ruin'] instinctively" (p. 182) and "The new régime had ... emerged ... into an era which, as far as human eye could see ... promised to restore what Horace had always loved and valued most..." (p. 250) stand in contradiction; the correct reading of *Odes* iii. 3. 12 (p. 186) is *bibet*, not *bibit* (cf. the recent edition of A. Y. Campbell [Liverpool, 1945] and the Teubner of Vollmer). There are two mistranslations: at *Odes* iii. 5. 3-4 (p. 189), where "because he has added" should be "after he has added"; and at iii. 5. 45-48 (p. 190), where "Then ... he went his way" misconstrues *donec ... properaret*. The reference (p. 207) to a transgression by the emperor's family of the "Augustan laws" (*sic*) and the disillusionment of Horace thereat (ca. 23-20 B.C.) apparently is meant to recall the moral legislation of Augustus. But this did not occur until 18 B.C. (cf. also p. 158). Perhaps a careful editing would have eliminated some of the above, and also (in the proof stage) the typographical errors on page 32 ("worships" for "warships"), page 53 ("strang" for "strange"), page 115 ("it is ...?" for "is it ...?"), page 246 ("fourteenth" for "thirteenth" stanza).

The author has accorded undue authority to the alleged Maecenas-Agrippa debate (recorded by Dio) prior to the settlement of 27 B.C. (pp. 81-82, 159-65), and the highly suspect theory of an original draft of *Georgics*, Book IV, containing a eulogy of Gallus, has been accepted without question (p. 125).

A disturbing aspect of the work is the distorted picture of Augustus which it contains. Adopting Gibbon's phrase "crafty hypocrite" (p. 237) the author proceeds to paint the emperor (whom he likes to describe as "the man in the high heels") as immature (p. 159), lacking in competence, entirely dependent upon his ministers, who were chiefly responsible for the glory of the régime (p. 161), more crafty and plausible than Mussolini (p. 182). We may certainly decry with him the sacrifice of Cicero (p. 64) and the murder of the son of Cleopatra (pp. 157-58). We may also concede that Agrippa and Maecenas each possessed marks of individual greatness. But this estimate of Augustus by Mr. Noyes will hardly fit the complete picture of the emperor's statesmanship, his devotion to Rome and to his duty as the Roman *princeps*, his ability to choose men of merit as his administrative assistants and his capacity to retain their loyalties, his vast achievement.

On the basis of this picture of the emperor which

he has formed, the author sees new meanings in some of the odes. There is raillery at Augustus in iii. 3. 11-12 (p. 187). In two odes of Book IV Horace views Augustus with "something of the old irony" (p. 252): at iv. 2. 46-48 ("If Horace is not ironical in all this, nothing is ironical" [p. 257]); at iv. 5. 31-32 the fact that Augustus becomes a god at the second course is ironical; there is a "Faun-like smile" from the poet at iv. 5. 37 where *deus* is dropped for *dus* (pp. 251-53). It is worthy of note that in the interpretation of the ideas in iv. 5, no attention whatever has been given to iv. 15, where similar sentiments in praise of Augustus are expressed. At iv. 5. 5, according to Mr. Noyes, Horace is not praying for the mere presence of the emperor but "that the return of the man who represented the sovereign power of his country might bring to Italy the divine light of peace, and an ideal world" (p. 273). This is surely having one's cake and eating it! Generally speaking, we may agree that Horace had some reservations about Augustus and the régime during the period of *Odes*, Books I to III (p. 185), but the imputations of disingenuousness on the poet's part toward Augustus during the period of *Odes*, Book IV, are hardly convincing.

Reflections upon the religious life of Horace have occasioned some new interpretations of his verse. According to the author, Horace, in his later life, came to believe more and more in a Supreme Power (p. 194); the clap of thunder of *Odes* i. 34 is a metaphorical expression of something which happened to make the poet feel more intensely the sense of this directive Power in the world (p. 198); the firm belief in a Divine Providence which the poet cherished in his youth (the lost-in-the-woods episode!) remanifested itself in his older days (pp. 169, 227). In the course of the argument much stress is placed upon *Odes* i. 12, the central subject of which is not Augustus but the Divine Ruler. Lines 17-20, Mr. Noyes claims, are crucial and "go down to the depths of the argument for the existence of God" (pp. 200-1). Their whole weight centers in line 18, *nec viget quicquam simile aut secundum*. It is unfortunate that, in attaching so much weight to line 18 for his thesis, the author has neglected to notice the contradiction in lines 51-52 *tu secundo / Caesare regnes*, which deprives line 18 of any deeper meaning it might possibly have had. Lines 51-52 also nullify the position (invested with some importance by the author, p. 205) accorded Pallas in line 20. All in all, the religious argument offers nothing to refute the sceptical view so recently restated by L. P. Wilkinson (*Horace and His Lyric Poetry* [Cambridge, 1945], pp. 24-30).

Mention of two other novel interpretations must suffice. The author argues that *inulas* of *Sat. i. 7. 35* shows Horace's disillusionment "half way through the campaign" at Brutus' conduct and the war (pp. 47 and 58). But surely the date of the satire is too uncertain

to weave around the word such pregnant, temporal significance. The crude lines at *Sat.* i. 5. 84-85 represent to Mr. Noyes a substitution. Horace had originally penned a sentimental thought here on seeing once more his native, Apulian hills. This was later excised and the present lines, borrowed from Lucilius, were inserted by the poet so as to "bring no daws to peck at his heart" (p. 96). How can we possibly be certain of this?

The loyal spirit of Mr. Noyes' book and the downright enthusiasm it displays for the subject are most appealing. If it infects its general readers with a similar admiration for Horace it will have served a commendable purpose.

WILLIAM G. FLETCHER

UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE

Byzantine Egypt: Economic Studies. By ALLAN CHESTER JOHNSON and LOUIS C. WEST. ("Princeton University Studies in Papyrology," No. 6.) Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949. Pp. viii, 344. \$5.00.

While some portions of this work, such as the Introduction (pp. 3-6), can serve a more general audience, the technical terminology of its materials and the extreme abbreviation of its esoteric references make this in the main a book for readers with some training in papyrology or late Roman studies. This volume, covering the period from Diocletian to the Arab conquest in the seventh century, is a sequel to Professor Johnson's *Roman Egypt to the Reign of Diocletian*, in Tenney Frank, ed., *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome, Volume II* (Baltimore, 1936; cf. *CW*, XXX [1936-37], 75-76), with certain modifications in plan: problems of currency and coinage, taken up by the same authors in the preceding volume of the Princeton series, are here omitted; the technics of Nile-valley agriculture are not described again, since they remained essentially unchanged from the earlier period; and the inclusion of numerous illustrative documents in translation has been wisely abandoned in favor of simple citation or summary, thus halving the size of the book and doubling its usability. Following the Introduction the subject matter is treated in thirty-three sections under four major headings: "The Land" (pp. 7-93), "The People" (pp. 94-214), "Defense" (pp. 215-29), and "Taxation" (pp. 230-332). The book concludes with a brief statement on bibliography (pp. 333-35) and an Index (pp. 337-44).

The material with which this volume deals is so fragmentary and lacunose that satisfactory synthesis is impossible even for individual topics. For the most part, therefore, the authors are concerned with collecting and correlating the details provided by the farrago of extant

evidence from and on Byzantine Egypt. Those who work in this field will find particularly helpful the numerous lists of documents which the authors have compiled, e.g. sales and leases of land and buildings (pp. 78-93, 198-205), building materials (pp. 109-10), metals (pp. 117-19), papyrus (pp. 131-32), boats and trade routes (pp. 139-43), commercial imports (pp. 146-51), food, clothing, etc. (pp. 175-98; the reference in note 34, page 13, to a non-existent "Appendix" is apparently to this list), gratuities customarily paid to various officials of the swollen Byzantine bureaucracy (pp. 295-97), miscellaneous taxes attested by papyri and other sources (pp. 297-321). There will be numerous points where others will disagree with the authors' interpretation of the evidence, but this is not the place to indulge in the argument of such details. The presentation of the material is, on the whole, consistent in viewpoint and treatment. There are, however, a few cases where divergent or even contradictory remarks (cf., e.g., pp. 5 and 22; 23 and 94; 260, where note 6 negates the paragraph to which it is appended) suggest to the reviewer that different sections of the book may have been written by one or the other, rather than by both, of the authors. This is nowhere stated to be the case, but one of the authors does speak of himself in the singular on page 140.

To the extent that the authors have attempted to discern the general pattern of life in Byzantine Egypt, their drift is away from most current generalizations, especially those based on the evidence from the western part of the Roman Empire. They insist repeatedly that the rise of the manor and the praedial serfdom of the West is not, despite certain superficial resemblances, simultaneously observable in Egypt. To this reviewer it seems that, while the authors do well to emphasize and reject the over-simplification of previous generalizations, they go too far in the other direction in their insistence on isolating the institutions and developments of Byzantine Egypt from comparable phenomena in other parts of the Empire. This insistence in turn colors their interpretations, producing some extreme—and to this reviewer unacceptable—conclusions. Thus, from the evidence of continuing activity in sales and leases of land, and from their conviction (repeatedly affirmed) that Constantine's famous edict of 332 and also later *constitutiones* on *coloni* "could have had no significance for the Egyptian peasants of whom the vast majority were still tenants of the crown" (p. 261; cf. p. 26 *et passim*), they are led to conclude that in Byzantine Egypt "the peasant in the villages enjoyed greater freedom and security" than before (p. 6). Greater security, yes: for the new patron-client system emerged, despite repeated imperial prohibitions, precisely because this relationship offered the peasant a physical protection and an economic security he could not provide for himself. But greater freedom, hardly: this security, like

any other, had to be purchased at a price, and the evidence for the increasing restriction on the peasants' freedom of movement permeates the entire book. We are face to face here, of course, with one of the perennial problems of organized human society, one that is with us in peculiarly sharp focus today, the problem of reconciling freedom with security. This volume only touches such broader questions, however; its essential function is to collect the evidence on which further discussion must be based.

NAPHTALI LEWIS

BROOKLYN COLLEGE

this as her aim in English, and has been successful in its attainment.

Among the notes of particular interest are: page 177, note 4 (*congregari*), pages 179-80, note 44 (*pontifices*), pages 180-81, note 48 (*patres*), page 181, note 50 (*Navis Ecclesia*), page 182, note 80 (demonstrative Christians), pages 183-84, note 11 (slavery), page 189, note 29 (*Canticum of Canticles*), pages 191-92, note 68 (the Two Ways), pages 192-93, note 69 (four cardinal virtues), pages 195-96, note 122 (St. Augustine).

CHARLES C. MIEROW

CARLETON COLLEGE

Julianus Pomerius, The Contemplative Life. Translated by SR. MARY JOSEPHINE SUELZER. ("Ancient Christian Writers," No. 4.) Westminster, Md.: The Newman Bookshop, 1947. Pp. vi, 220. \$2.50.

This first English version of a treatise almost unknown at the present time, though popular in the Middle Ages, is a worthy addition to this notable new series of the works of the fathers in translation. Written at the close of the fifth century or the opening of the sixth by a native African, it was for almost a thousand years ascribed to St. Prosper of Aquitaine. Julianus Pomerius, here recognized as its author, was "the last-recorded of the rhetors of Gaul" (p. 3) and the teacher of St. Caesarius of Arles. He gives us in this work for the first time the classical distinction between active and contemplative life. The active life (he says) is the state of the soul which is seeking perfection; the contemplative life that of the soul which possesses and enjoys it. The text on which this translation is based is that of J. B. le Brun des Marettes and D. Mangeant (Paris, 1711).

The work is divided into three books. The first of these deals with the contemplative life; the second with the active life; the third with a discussion of the vices and the virtues.

The translation is prefaced by an interesting Introduction (pp. 3-12) and supplemented by Notes (pp. 173-96) and a full Index (pp. 199-220).

Sister Mary Josephine Suelzer has produced a rendition of the work that reads easily and is marked by numerous passages in which the English version admirably reproduces the rhetorical effectiveness of the original text: e.g. i. 2 (p. 19), i. 13. 2 (p. 35), i. 25. 1 (pp. 50-51), ii. 5. 2 (pp. 66-67), iii. 13 (pp. 131-32), iii. 34. 1 and 2 (pp. 168-69).

Julianus Pomerius says (p. 169): "... a good Latin style is one that expresses briefly and clearly the things to be understood." The translator has apparently adopted

Vergil the Universal. By T. J. HAARHOFF. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1949. Pp. ix, 126. 8s. 6d.

This brief volume, by a distinguished scholar, is addressed primarily to South African readers, but it deserves the attention of classicists elsewhere. Professor Haarhoff has, of course, as his bibliography shows, made good use of the works of recent scholarship to supplement his own labors; more important, perhaps, than his evident industry is his sympathetic understanding of the poet whom he takes as guide. The author, however, has not chosen to write a book wholly concerned with Virgil or his works, although, as when he deals with the *Gates of Sleep*, he often sheds light on obscurities; rather he illustrates in practice how wisdom drawn from the thought and feeling of the Roman may enlighten our approach to modern problems.

To assess the accuracy of the many parallels drawn in these pages would demand a knowledge of South African history which this reviewer cannot claim, although one need not be a specialist to appreciate the interest of such a chapter as that on Stoicism and Calvinism. For most of us, however, the value of this book will lie in its aim rather than in its content. Classicists often assert that the wisdom of the past can aid in the solution of modern problems, but seldom indicate to the general public the conclusions to which study of that wisdom has led them. Thus we leave it to a busy judge to suggest that our trial procedure might be improved by wider application of the Greek approach to justice; evidently if classicists abjure their task it will be assumed by others. Dr. Haarhoff has shown that Virgil can be a guide and inspiration to one concerned with the pressing problems of South African thought and life: it may be hoped that our mature scholars will accept the challenge and begin to claim that intellectual leadership of society which their default has allowed to pass into other hands.

DONALD C. MACKENZIE

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

NOTES AND NEWS

This department will deal with events of interest to classicists; the contribution of pertinent items will be welcomed. Also welcome will be items for the section on *Personalalia*, which will deal with appointments, promotions, fellowships, and other professionally significant activities of our colleagues in high schools, colleges, and universities.

The American Philological Association, at its Eighty-First Annual Meeting, held in Baltimore on December 28 to 30, 1949, elected the following officers: President, Professor LUCIUS ROGERS SHERO of Swarthmore College; First Vice-President, Professor WILLIAM CHASE GREENE of Harvard University; Second Vice-President, Professor THOMAS ROBERT SHANNON BROUGHTON of Bryn Mawr College; Secretary-Treasurer, Professor MERIWETHER STUART of Hunter College; Editor, Professor PHILIP HOWARD DELACY of Washington University.

PERSONALIA

Professor William C. McDermott of the University of Pennsylvania has been named editor of the series "Translations and Reprints from the Original Sources of History" which is published by that University's Department of History.

The Reverend M. Joseph Costelloe, S.J., of the Catholic University of America has been granted an award under the Fulbright Act for a year's study in Rome. His research will be concerned with the Roman persecution of the early Christians.

THE HARRY DE FOREST SMITH SCHOLARSHIP, AMHERST COLLEGE

For students in Greek, in their senior year at school, Amherst College offers a freshman scholarship of \$550, to be awarded on the basis of a competitive examination. The examination this year will be held on March 6 in each of the schools where there are one or more candidates for the scholarship. An announcement of the man who stands first in the examination will be made on or before March 23. The actual award will be made at the time when the successful competitor is notified of his admission to Amherst College. The holder of the scholarship will be required to take one of the regular courses in the Department of Greek during his freshman year.

The examination, two hours in length, is open to students who are in their second or third year of Greek. It will consist of three parts:

1. A prose passage for translation into English;
2. (a) For candidates who are in their second year, a second prose passage;

(b) For candidates who are in their third year, a passage from Homer;

3. A brief essay on some topic connected with Greek literature. The examination is so arranged that students offering only two years of Greek are in no way handicapped. Students interested in competing for the scholarship should consult the teacher of Greek in their school, who will set the place and hour for the examination.

Amherst College is attempting to make this scholarship a real distinction. The stipend is set at an amount equivalent to full tuition, and the award will be made without regard to financial need. The holder of the scholarship will be known as the Harry de Forest Smith Scholar, a title which he may retain so long as he pursues the study of Greek and is scholastically eligible for a full scholarship of the type ordinarily granted to Amherst undergraduates. The scholarship is held this year by Donald Weiss, who prepared for college at the Boston Latin School, Boston, Massachusetts. His teacher was Dr. William H. Marnell.

The Department of Classics at Amherst College will be grateful for any steps that teachers of Greek may take to bring this scholarship to the attention of prospective candidates. Each teacher of Greek who wishes to cooperate is asked (1) to post this notice on his bulletin board, (2) to notify Professor John A. Moore, Department of Classics, Amherst College, Amherst, Massachusetts, before February 24, as to how many students in his classes will presumably take the examination, and (3) to set an hour for the examination on March 6 and to provide suitable supervision. The sponsors of the scholarship will be most grateful for such cooperation.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Here will be listed all books received by THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY the subjects of which are deemed to fall within the WEEKLY's scope. Listing here neither precludes nor assures a subsequent review. Books received will not be returned, whether or not they are listed or reviewed.

BURRISS, ELI E. and CASSON, LIONEL. *Latin and Greek in Current Use*. ("Prentice-Hall Classics Series.") 2d ed.; New York: Prentice-Hall, 1949. Pp. xi, 292. \$3.25.

HIGHT, GILBERT. *The Classical Tradition: Greek and Roman Influences on Western Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1949. Pp. xxxviii, 763. \$6.00.

OLIVER, ANDREW. *A History of Greek Literature in Graphic Form*. Boston: Privately Printed, 1948. Pp. 42. \$1.30. (May be obtained from the author at 198 Aspinwall Avenue, Brookline 46, Mass.)



For over a quarter of a century
ULLMAN AND HENRY LATIN
has led the field
in succeeding editions

LATIN FOR AMERICANS

BOOK I - for first year :: BOOK II - for second year

•

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

New York : Boston : Chicago : Dallas : Atlanta : San Francisco

